

EVENING SITTING

MOTION UNDER RULE 46

**Kyoto Protocol
(continued)**

Hon. Mr. Wartman: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before the recess I was talking about a number of the very progressive things that we've been engaged in in this province as a government and as a people, and I think it speaks well to the recognition of the realities that global warming is a fact that we must deal with.

I think that from what I was hearing earlier in the presentation of some of the members opposite, there still seems to be in their mind some doubt about the reality of global warming, and I know that there are scientists around the world that can be dredged up that would hold that position as well.

But I think overall we've seen that there have been some significant changes that really do give clear evidence and I think we see enough . . . around the world we see enough scientists who are world's leading climate experts who have given this . . . just to quote from a paper:

It became harder and harder to scrounge up respectable scientists to argue the "It's just a coincidence" case, especially after the UN brought together 2,500 (2,500) of the world's leading climate experts who concluded the global warming problem was largely man-made and required urgent worldwide action.

So, yes, there are scientists who would say, you know, it's just a coincidence; really it's just a small thing in geological time. But the overwhelming evidence says that global warming is a reality that we must deal with. We recognize that. I think Alberta and the US (United States), who the members opposite like to quote, recognize that as well because of the actions that they're taking.

So we continue to try and develop based on the realities of this world. We have a plan that we're engaging in and, Mr. Speaker, I think I hear the members opposite say they have a plan over and over again, but I'm afraid that when I try and get any . . . hear any substance or see if there is any substance in that plan, it comes out hot air. And about the only thing that they're going to grow in this province, Mr. Speaker, is maybe a balloon and one of these days it's going to burst in their face because you have to have substance and you have to plan around the reality. It can't just be cheap sloganeering which we're hearing from the members opposite as they try and posture as the government in waiting.

What we really need is real work based on real evidence that's building towards a successful future, and that's what this government has been doing. And we can see that evidence in an economy that is growing and is leading throughout this last decade for much of the decade. So enough of the nonsense from the other side. Let's get down to the real world where we have to do something.

The federal government had the power to make the decision that they made this afternoon and what we need to do is make sure, along with the other provinces and with the territories, that we get the best deal that can possibly be got so that it will be fair to all the people of this country, to every region of this country. That's what our motion is about. It's about getting the best deal possible.

And these 12 principles that are laid out here have the potential to do that. To put it in negative terms, as the members opposite have done in their amendment, I think is just destructive. That's not where we need to go. We need to defeat that amendment, and then they need to get on board and pass this motion that we have put before the legislature, and then together we need to work in this province to make sure that we get tremendous benefit.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wartman: — Mr. Speaker, I think there are some other things that we have to look at. We have to get beyond the parochial view that so often is held by members opposite. We have to look at a world where we are a small part of the population, where our footprint may not be that big. But we are also industrial leaders in this world. We have one of the highest standards of living in this world, and we have some responsibility, given the level of knowledge that we have in this world, and so we must act.

And the Kyoto accord, at its best, calls upon the industrialized countries that have that knowledge and have that ability to act to lead the way to develop the technologies so that those countries which are in a position as developing countries will have the advantage of the work that we've done.

So we can do this not just for ourselves, but to make a better world, to provide a pathway for others to follow. And that's what this is about. It's about doing the right thing for ourselves in this province, for our nation, and for this world. And we've got the ability to do that. I talked earlier about the progressive nature of some of our developments in agriculture, about zero tillage and the industry . . . the implement industry that is built up around that, that we export worldwide on that front. We export the knowledge as well as the technology. And Mr. Speaker, this is making a difference in the world. It's making a difference in this province and throughout the world.

We will be leaders in the development of biofuels, and when we are into biofuels as fully as we can be, both ethanol and some of the bio-diesels, Mr. Speaker, we will see a level of . . . the level and the nature of cropping in this province change as well.

We will see hybrid poplars which are also good for carbon sequestration. We'll see a change of cropping so that we're growing crops like . . . probably hemp will be one of the crops that is grown widely because it has both oils and the kind of cellulose base that you need to produce really good ethanol.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are developing the technologies. We are developing the cropping methods. And we are moving into a future that will help the farmers of this province, that will help industry in this province, and that will provide a pathway for

people across the nation and throughout the world. And it's far from the negative doom and gloom atmosphere that those members across the other side put out continually.

So let's pass this, these 12 principles here, and then let's get on working with the other provinces to make sure that this is the best deal that it can possibly be for all the people of this province. We've had enough of the empty rhetoric from the other side. Let's get down to doing some good work. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dearborn: — Well thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dearborn: — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favour of the amendment. There's a great deal of concern with the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in its present form for our country, our province, and the constituency of Kindersley.

As this is my maiden speech, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that I be allowed to speak in the last few minutes of my speech just about my constituency, and I'll try to keep that brief. Thank you.

The problems of the Kyoto Protocol are many and varied in complexity, and I'd like to speak to seven areas of concern. The first is the economic damage that signing on to Kyoto will have for our province. The second is the limited effect the Protocol will have from Canada's participation on global greenhouse gas emissions. The third point is the validity of the science surrounding the measurement and, more importantly, projections of climate change relative to greenhouse gas emissions caused by human beings.

The fourth point is the environmental concerns of a local nature which will not be addressed because of resources being allocated to deal with greenhouse gases. The fifth point — we will discuss the flawed logic of the projected increase of human-caused greenhouse gases relative to Third World countries industrializing over the next 100 years, relative to the growth rate of the advancement of technologies over the past 20 years.

The sixth point will deal with the moral implications concerning the movement of Canadian monies via the international trading emissions.

And the last point is the fact that regardless of all these problems, if the Protocol ratification is rammed down our throats without provincial consent, it will not be binding relative to the lack of participation by the international community via the target set within the Kyoto accord for the Protocol to meet.

On the first point the economic damage signing on to Kyoto will have for our province, earlier this morning the member from Prince Albert Northcote alluded to — or rather the member from Athabasca said 6,000 permanent jobs would be lost by 2010. This is something that we can't afford. Local experts in the petroleum industry from the Kindersley riding

have told me that it will affect the riding to the amount of 15 per cent of the gross revenue for the constituency as a whole.

As many members on this side of the House and opposite know, the Kindersley constituency has been plagued by drought now, in some areas for three years ongoing. The oil patch is very, very important to our overall economy. It's also important to farm families that get second incomes in the patch, often during the winter. The implementation of the Kyoto Protocol could have serious damage to the local Kindersley economy, taking millions of dollars out of it, and we just can't afford this right now.

Further, we're in a situation right now economically across the province where we've deficit budgeted, possibly two years in a row here. The local constituents of Kindersley whom I represent . . . I can't in good conscience say to them that I would be in favour of implementation of the Kyoto Protocol if it's going to take all this money out of the riding.

Mr. Speaker, the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol could have the effect of draining jobs and draining money from our province which I could really see just adding to our province's debt load. Our province doesn't need more debt. We've been in a deficit budget for some time. The people of Kindersley are tired of crisis management to the economy of this province by the members opposite for the past number of years.

We don't want to see our oil and gas industry suffer significantly and then in a year's time, the Finance minister getting a look at the books and seeing that there's no money left, seeing that panic is on the rise and looking for solutions, and the only thing he can come up with is picking up the phone and saying, operator, what's the number for 911? That's not going to fix our economy. Being in touch with the international community with regards to why the United States has not signed on . . . it will affect our productivity. It will hurt us.

The second point is the limited effect the Protocol would have from Canada's participation, on global greenhouse gas emissions. I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to meet with some experts at the University of Saskatchewan who brought up clearly that Canada's overall emissions globally for greenhouse gas amount to around 2 per cent. Two per cent globally is a very insignificant amount and the reductions of that 2 per cent to 1990 levels will be miniscule. Virtually nothing will be done by our signing on to this to help greenhouse gas emissions be reduced on the global scale. It's just . . . the fact of the matter is it's the attempt of the Prime Minister — a lame-duck prime minister — to have a legacy on the way out, and it won't do anything to help our environment.

The third point focuses around the validity of the sciences, and this the scientific community is split on. Geologists do know that there has been a fluctuation up and down in how much greenhouse gases have been in the atmosphere over the centuries . . . or over the millenniums rather. It's been postulated that volcanic eruption alone can emit more CO₂ into the atmosphere than the entirety of what human beings have done since the industrial revolution.

This fact was also put forth by the experts that they are not exactly sure about this, but again the importance of having this

put through to make a statement that Canada is on board and takes this claim seriously.

We'd all like to see a good and clean environment for our country and for our province, but it has to be in balance. I've heard people opposite on the other side of the House say exactly that today. It cannot be in balance if it is going to penalize us economically. And again, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Taxpayers Association has stated that \$2,700 per family would be lost due to the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol in Canada — more for Alberta and Saskatchewan. There is no way in Kindersley, in the riding of Kindersley, after three years of drought, that we can afford — any of our families — a reduction of \$2,700 a year from our families' incomes.

It's just not feasible right now, and that's the reason that, regardless of the principles which we all seem to be in favour of, we should be sending a clear statement that we reject the implementation of the Kyoto accord in its present form.

The fourth point that I would like to raise deals with the allocations of resources with regards to greenhouse gas emissions. There's going to be hundreds of millions of dollars set aside to implement the Kyoto Protocol at the federal level. We don't know how that's going to affect us provincially, but the fact of the matter is we do have environmental concerns in the province which are of an important nature. In the North, we have dirty sites from old uranium mines. We also have problems with diminished habitat for our wildlife. And as we have many rural constituencies on this side of the House, and many farmers, this is something that we don't want to see left unattended to.

I think that we have a responsibility to be sharing this province with the creatures that were here before we were. And the giving only money or allocating resources to greenhouse gas emissions and taking away from things that we can see that are more tangible and actually dealing with environmental concerns is a mistake. There is another reason that we should be sending a strong message not to ratify the Protocol.

There is a . . . The fifth point speaks of a logic used by the negotiators in why they want to implement the Kyoto accord as a whole. And it's flawed, I believe, in the fact that it wants to address greenhouse gas emissions but the models that they've been looking at have to do with how industrialized countries have increased their greenhouse gas emissions up to this point, and they've used historical models. As most of us know from our history lessons, the Industrial Revolution only really started 150 years ago. There was a lot of pollution when it started with coal. It's moved on to oil.

There are cleaner energy forms coming on every 50 to 100 years. And we now have options of natural gas, nuclear energy. And these are important things, Mr. Speaker, that I think we'll see adopted globally at a faster rate than were ever implemented in what are now the G-8 countries.

Mr. Speaker, this fact, I think in a global environment, is sort of proven out by something called Moore's Law which has to do more specifically with technology but it has to do with . . . Moore's Law has to do with computer chips which basically states that computer chips will double in capacity and half in

cost every 18 months. And this has proven to be more than true.

More or less, Mr. Speaker, if we take this law and we look at how technology is applied across the board in all industries and we look at how advancements are going to be made in industrializing countries — which are currently Third World countries — it's a fallacy to believe that they're going to progress on the exact same rate as say Great Britain or the United States did when they were early participants in the Industrial Revolution.

I think if we look at a country like Korea, which has seen a great leap forward, post the Korean War, it hasn't taken them as long to come up to standards which maybe are not ideal, but they're definitely not comparable to what existed in, say, 1890 in London.

And the fact is as India and China become more and more industrial . . . they have a lot of problems now. I believe that over time the global environment — and this is the economic environment — will force them to be competitive, will force them to have cleaner use of energy, which will force them to use cleaner forms of energy. And that being said, I think the premise of the Kyoto Protocol estimating that the greenhouse gas emissions from developing economies is going to be the same as it was historically for the now-developed economies is wrong.

The sixth point that I had wished to make discussed the moral implications concerning the movements of Canadian monies vis-à-vis international emissions trading. This morning the member from Prince Albert Northcote alluded to emission purchases happening from Russia. And this bothers me quite a bit because I don't think that the political structures are necessarily in place in some of these countries where we would possibly be buying emissions or our industries would be buying emissions. I would feel it is not responsible for us to be saying anything but that we reject the Protocol which would see monies going from Canada into Russia, possibly funding wars in Chechnya. I don't think that this is the right avenue and this is just one of the possibilities which does exist.

The fact of how wealth should be traded around the world I think has been proven and it's been proven very well over the past 50 years with two competing ideologies of how economies work: a centrally run economy which has failed — it's failed in numerous countries; the members across, on the other side of the Assembly, haven't quite caught on fully to this — and the other one that has been successful has been the free enterprise system. And what has happened in the countries that have adopted that is that they don't keep it only in their country. They go out and they look for new markets and they look for new resources and they look for new production. And there is a clear correlation between this and the movement of democracy as a whole. And that, Mr. Speaker, I think is a good and responsible thing.

Trying to pass monies on to irresponsible countries for goals that are set on emission standards on a kind of ad hoc basis I don't think is the right thing for the Saskatchewan taxpayers or for Canada. And I do think that there are moral implications that we should be aware of and that we should be conscious of wanting to speak out against this.

The last point had to do with the fact that for the Protocol to meet its own internal standards, there was a certain number of countries had to sign on that had a certain number that, as a group, had a number of emissions as a total. And the lack of participation in the United States and the lack of participation of China have failed to make this a reality.

So when the original accord was set out with the Protocol to meet these certain documents and yet we're going to go forward with it even though the goal as a whole is not going to be met, I don't think that that's . . . the statement from the experts is, well, the UN (United Nations) will just amend it down.

So it again brings into question, Mr. Speaker, the real impact that the Kyoto Protocol is going to have on this, on the reduction globally of greenhouse gases. Are we just being set up to be an example for a legacy of a lame-duck prime minister? I think that's a pretty poor reason for going forward, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like now, if I may, to speak very briefly about the Kindersley constituency. It's with honour that I'm here today representing these good folk. My family has lived there since the foundation of our province. We have deep roots there. We really appreciate the communities, all of them in the north and the south. We appreciate their good works, the church communities, the local civic groups, and I look forward to representing them to the best of my ability in the future.

And incidentally, as it was Kyoto today that we were speaking of, it was a large campaign issue and I've been asked personally to speak against it and I hope that I've done my duty to that effect tonight. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Forbes: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak today on this very important topic. And before I start I want to welcome and acknowledge the new member from Kindersley. He displaces me as the newest member and now I guess I'd move up to the junior ranks or whatever. But I do want to welcome him and congratulate him on his first speech, his maiden speech.

Now I guess the customary greeting is we wish you a great time, a wonderful time — your time is rewarding — but not a long time. The next few months we hope is, is one of your best. So thank you very much.

And I also want to thank the Minister of Industry and Resources and the Minister of Environment for their leadership and stewardship on this challenging, challenging issue before us. I think and I believe that this is an important opportunity here to show real leadership on this global issue.

I support fully the main motion, but certainly not the amendment, because I think it's truly ill thought out and frankly out of touch, particularly with all the good economic news our province is having. Our future is wide open, not closed down if you were to listen to the naysayers across the way. I think there's a lot of opportunity here, a real win-win situation.

I believe the motion here today has vision, is pragmatic, and has

clear vision, and it demonstrates clear, pragmatic principles. This is an important, timely debate. The Kyoto Protocol has been passed today in the House of Commons and we must get on with some very serious negotiations. And this calls for strong, balanced leadership for this national strategy.

But before I get too far into this, I want to talk about a story. At the Premier's dinner in Saskatoon we had the good fortune of sitting with four engineers. And someone at our table thought we'd take advantage of the opportunity to ask these engineers what they thought of the Kyoto Protocol, and this is what they said. They replied, what do you think of public education? And we thought, what do we think of public education? What's that got to do with Kyoto?

And it became clear after a while they were talking about the shift in thinking that had to take place in the early 1800s when we were faced with the challenges of the Industrial Revolution and child labour. We had to think in a different way. Those were challenging times, I'm sure, just like they are now. But we had to think in a different way and we had to take some risks. We had to have some solid plans.

Now I want to . . . This spurred me on to do a little research, but there's some parallels here between that time and the challenging times we face now with the environment. It was not until 1833 that factory laws were passed protecting children. This legislation required compulsory schooling — the beginning of public education as we know it today. It also included the cleanliness of the workplace. Fourteen years later, the Ten-Hour Act was passed, limiting the number of hours worked by 13- to 18-year-olds to 10 hours a day. And it was not until 1867 that these laws were extended to cover small factories and workshops.

Now I found very interesting a passage in the *Hansard* from London . . . London, England, dated April 4, 1879. And you could almost transfer what was . . . this discussion, especially from the other side, when they talk about scientists and the environment. But in that time, they were talking about work, and is work hard or is it light— what's work like for children and whether or not we should actually be serious about that issue. And here today we're talking about environment and whether or not we should be serious about that. And here's the quote from *Hansard*, April 4, 1879:

The other is the old, often repeated and often refuted argument that work is light. Light. Why no doubt much of it is light if measured by the endurance of three or four minutes. But what say you, my Lords, to a continuing of toil in a standing posture and a poisonous atmosphere for 13 hours with 15 minutes of rest? What say you then of children, children of the tenderest years, why they become stunted, crippled, deformed, useless. I speak what I know. I state what I've seen.

When I visited Bradford in Yorkshire in 1838, being desirous to see the condition of the children for I knew that they were employed at very early ages in the worst business, I asked for a collection of cripples and deformities. And in a short time, 80 were gathered in the large courtyard. And when I visited Bradford under the limitation of hours that was passed, the Ten-Hour Act that

was passed some years afterwards, I called for a similar extradition of cripples. But — God be praised! — there was not one to be found in that vast city, yet the work of these poor sufferers had been light if measured by minutes, but terrific if measured by hours.

Now I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if we'll have the same privilege to see, because we passed . . . the Kyoto Protocol was passed in the House of Commons today, in 10 years the difference in the environment. And I hope that we can see that, but this is the kind of action that takes many years to see the outcomes. And I think they were visionary in that time, and we're visionary now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to just reiterate that these were engineers that were talking. These were people who value innovation, who see opportunities. And this is a real win-win situation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the plan is real, achievable, balanced, not slogans pinched together.

I want to speak tonight on three different parts, three different principles. I recognize that all 12 principles are important because they speak to different sectors in our communities. And added together, the wonderful thing is that the sum of the 12 parts are greater . . . the whole is greater than the sum of the 12 parts.

The first principle I think is very, very important. All Canadians must have an opportunity for full and informed input into the development of the plan, and today is the start of that. This debate is very, very critical, and this is where we get to pull out some of those ideas, and this is an important start.

Another example is the Saskatchewan Stakeholder Advisory Committee. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was not just started this year or last year; this was started in 1998 and was set up to permit government and stakeholders to exchange information on views on climate change issues. Stakeholders on the committee represent a variety of agricultural, environmental, industry, and community groups. The committee assists government officials to determine which climate change initiatives should be taken within Saskatchewan.

(19:30)

Now the other one that I think is very, very important is no. 8. The plan must support innovation and new technology and I want to continue with the lists of illustrations of the innovation that's happened within this, within this province. The first — I think was very insightful — was the establishment of the office of energy conservation in September 2002. As well, Saskatchewan has been working with EnCata Corporation and various other interested parties to initiate the Weyburn carbon dioxide monitoring project. And Saskatchewan's contributing \$2.3 million to this project.

Saskatchewan's participating in a multi-client project with the Alberta Research Council to study the feasibility of injecting carbon dioxide into the deep underground coal seams to permanently dispose of carbon dioxide and produce natural gas. As well, Saskatchewan's providing \$1.8 million out of Innovation and Science Fund to assist in the establishment of the International Test Centre for Carbon Dioxide Capture at the

University of Regina.

SaskPower is conducting a series of studies on the feasibility of various distributed generation projects reusing, or using renewable energy sources such as solar power, wood waste, livestock waste, and municipal wastes. As well, Saskatchewan Energy, or SaskEnergy, has spent several million dollars over the past several years to save energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in a cost-effective manner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention as well to SaskPower *Climate Change Action Plan Progress Report 2001*. And I think this is very insightful, very good reading here about some of the innovation that's happening here in this province, for example, transmission line projects that they've taken — the Condie and Queen Elizabeth transmission line linking the Condie switching station near Regina to the Queen Elizabeth power station in Saskatchewan. Completed in '97, this line was designed to improve transmission reliability and efficiency between these power stations. As a result, SaskPower saved an estimated 120 million kilowatts of electricity in 2001 and the CO₂ reduction was over 100,000 tonnes in 2001. Another example of innovation.

The other principle I want to speak on is the plan must include incentives for all citizens, communities, businesses, and jurisdictions to make the shift to an economy based on renewable and other clean energy, lower emissions, and sustainable practices across the sector.

Mr. Speaker, I look to the federal government for real leadership here. This is a critical piece. Right across the country but most importantly here, the federal government must come to the table prepared to support Canadians, Canadian industry, to develop a truly sustainable economy. The province is doing as much as we can but this is an important piece.

Now I want to end with the idea about the slogans that we've heard across the floor here, and in the news and the media. And some of these I think are pretty important because they get out some bad ideas about why we shouldn't develop a plan that will meet the needs of Canadians and people in Saskatchewan here as we go along with the Kyoto Protocol.

And the first one is, and we've heard this many times today, that the science is uncertain. And we know for sure that this is a poor slogan. This misleads the people of Saskatchewan and damages the intent of the Kyoto Protocol. And you can find examples of where people say the science is uncertain, and the one that we think of most often is the tobacco companies that still find scientists to say that smoking doesn't cause cancer. And we know that that's true. And so the list goes on with those examples where you can find scientists that say things like that.

The other one that I think is important to dispel is the slogan that doing nothing costs nothing. And we know that especially, and we hear people talk about the drought in Western Canada and particularly the area around Kindersley and that area — three years of drought. We can't afford to do nothing. It's important that we take this initiative and develop a solid plan.

And the other issue, the other slogan is, well we only produce 3 per cent of the global emissions; why should we do anything?

And I think the . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the member from Carrot River Valley on his feet?

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Request leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Kwiatkowski: — Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, my daughter, Carla, who is seated in your gallery. Carla is doing her first year of early childhood education here in Regina and finding it both challenging and rewarding. This evening Carla is accompanied by the grandson of the member from Kelvington-Wadena, and that is Tyrell Draude. And Tyrell, can I get you to wave to everyone?

I would ask all members to welcome Tyrell and Carla to the Assembly this evening.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Speaker: — Why is the member from Regina Coronation Park on his feet?

Mr. Trew: — Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for leave to introduce guests.

Leave granted.

Mr. Trew: — I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank all hon. colleagues in the Assembly. Tonight it's my great pleasure to introduce someone that most of us don't need to be introduced to, but Bob Lyons, a former MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) for Regina Rosemont. Bob and I shared an office in my first term in this building and I've developed a bit of a hearing problem and part of it is from Bob Lyons who I swear didn't need a telephone. If he was going to call someone in Estevan, he could just open the window and holler and it would have the same effect.

Anyway Bob and his wife, Elaine Nystrom, are in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. And I ask all members to welcome them to the Assembly tonight.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to join my colleague in welcoming Bob and Elaine to the legislature. For those people who don't know, Bob has become . . . along with his wife Elaine, has become a very successful entrepreneur in our province. They've just opened up a new restaurant in Saskatoon, the Spadina Free House, selling Roca Jack's coffee, and it is a booming success. So I want to welcome Bob and Elaine to the legislature and congratulate them on their new business in our fair city of Saskatoon.

Ms. Draude: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to . . .

The Speaker: — Proceed.

Ms. Draude: — . . . join with my colleague from Carrot River and to welcome the two people in your gallery to the Assembly — my friend, Carla, and my grandson, Tyrell. I have two grandsons and this is not the little one that I share with the MLA from Melfort-Tisdale. Tyrell lives with me and his mother at my place and I'm really glad to see you here tonight, Tyrell.

MOTION UNDER RULE 46

Kyoto Protocol (continued)

Mr. Forbes: — I'll conclude by just talking about a couple of more slogans that I have a problem with. The one, as I was saying about, why act when we only produce 3 per cent of global emissions? Well we know in our country we have only point five per cent of the world population. And I think it is our global responsibility to show leadership on this issue and this is what this plan talks about, very much.

As well we talked about the Americans not doing very much. Well we know 42 states are acting very . . . have a lot of initiatives in this area. California . . . Texas is planning to install more than 2,000 megawatts of wind capacity energy there. So that, that slogan is full of hot air.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the worst slogan of all is that Saskatchewan, no matter how good the plan is, our economy will be devastated. And that's the Saskatchewan Party line. It's doom and gloom. No matter what, we will drag our heels on this. And I think this is shameful, and I think that it's our responsibility, moral responsibility, our economic responsibility as we go into the 21st century, to show leadership on this issue. And I think this motion demonstrates this clearly while the amendment acts against it. So I will be standing in favour of the motion. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Ms. Eagles: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to rise in the Assembly and speak on behalf of the people of the constituency of Estevan who I'm honoured to represent.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, on behalf of my constituents, congratulate the member for Kindersley on his recent election. And I'm sure he, like the rest of us, will find this position very challenging but also very rewarding.

Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure all members of this Assembly are aware, the constituency I represent has a very diverse economy, with coal-fired power plants, coal mines, oil, natural gas, and of course agriculture.

Because of this diverse economy, the people of the Estevan constituency feel that this area would be one of the hardest hit areas with the ratification of the Kyoto accord. I have talked to numerous people, and they, like my colleagues on this side of the House, realize that despite the fact that measures have to be taken to protect our environment, this accord as it is today fails

miserably.

And according to recent polls, the more people come to understand Kyoto, the more opposition there is to it in its present form. Some people, Mr. Speaker, have the misconception that if Kyoto is ratified, the smog over large cities will magically disappear and all our common pollution problems will be a thing of the past. And even the famous illusionist, David Copperfield, could not accomplish this. Nothing could be further from the truth. Kyoto does not deal with pollution. It deals with greenhouse gas emissions.

Canada contributes 2 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. Countries like Russia, China, India, and the United States are responsible for approximately 65 per cent of these emissions. Many of these countries are not signing on. And if they are, they have no targets, as in the case of Russia and Mexico. Unlike Canada, the United States realizes the devastating effect Kyoto will have on their economy. Here in Saskatchewan, SaskPower has predicted astronomical increases for energy costs. This burden would of course be passed on to the shoulders of the taxpayers. IPSCO has said that they would have to relocate in another jurisdiction. The chamber of commerce has voiced concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has been very sketchy with the details. How will Kyoto affect jobs, taxes, and the economy? Why is the government rushing to ratify Kyoto without informing and consulting citizens? Has the government made an effort to create a made-in-Canada plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while protecting our economic prosperity?

The plan is full of words such as consider, work toward, and work with. Everything will be painless, as in the plan will not affect personal disposable income, cost jobs, or worsen industries' competitive position. The plan will be prudent, responsible, and flexible. The government will minimize the cost of meeting Canada's climate change objectives.

And just tonight on the news, Mr. Speaker, it was stated that the cost of Kyoto so far is \$1.6 billion. And I think we are all quite nervous here when we hear the federal government speak regarding monetary aspects. This is the same federal government that predicted the gun control Bill, Bill C-68, would cost \$2 million. Now we learn that 1 billion has been spent. To say that they are grossly over budget is the biggest understatement of the year. This is what happens when you cram legislation down the throats of people who are opposed to it.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware and want a cleaner environment, but I fail to see how an agreement where credits can be bought and sold will work. We need a made-in-Canada agreement. We know these journeys start with a small step. Under Kyoto in its present form, those steps are leading down the wrong road. Scientists don't agree. They can't assure us that there is a trend to global warming. Now they say it could be cyclical. Henry Hengeveld, chief science adviser for climate change for Environment Canada, appeared before the Senate committee on agriculture just this last week and said this, and I quote:

Over the last 2,000 years, we have seen the global cooling

of approximately 1 degree in terms of the slow, downward trend. It has not been quite in the last 2,000 years. The peak of the current interglacial was 5 or 6,000 years ago. It was about 1 degree warmer than today.

(19:45)

Saskatchewan generates significant amounts of carbon dioxide as a result of the use of coal-fired power generation as does mining, forestry, oil, and gas. Agriculture would be severely affected because of the high consumption of energy products whose prices would rise under Kyoto — diesel fuel, natural gas for grain drying, and fertilizer.

The provincial Department of Industry and Resources estimates Kyoto would cost as much as \$2.6 billion in economic output by the year 2020. SaskPower estimates Kyoto could cost the provincial power utility as much as \$250 million per year. Just imagine your electricity bill.

IPSCO, one of our largest industrial companies, has said that ratification could force the company to move to the United States. Saskatchewan's most important trading partner, the United States, is not ratifying and therefore will not incur the same new costs as Saskatchewan companies.

The Canadian Taxpayers Federation estimates ratification will cost every family in Canada \$2,700 per year, and more if you live in Saskatchewan. The Canadian exporters and manufacturers association estimate Kyoto could kill 450,000 jobs in Canada. The chamber of commerce, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, estimates Kyoto could cost \$30 billion in economic output annually.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we have run out of money to fund health care, to support well drilling and dugout digging, at a time when we don't have the money to support our water infrastructure programs in communities so that they can have clean, safe water, why in the world would we sign up only to slow down our economy and send money to Russia for credits?

And think about it. How long will it take for the non-Kyoto countries like the United States, China, and India to fully offset our small contribution?

Mr. Speaker, there is general agreement among all countries and in Canada by all provinces that the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions is desirable, but as Ralph Klein, Premier of Alberta, said on September 3, and I quote:

It's like signing a mortgage for property you have never seen and for a price that you have never discussed. At the very least, the federal government must first evaluate cost, create a realistic implementation plan, and then consult with the provinces, including a meeting of the first ministers.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is a made-in-Saskatchewan, made-in-Canada approach that balances the need to protect our environment and address climate change with the equally critical need to get Saskatchewan's economy growing again.

And, Mr. Speaker, I find it very unfortunate that our provincial

government doesn't show leadership and they prove this by catering to the extreme left of their caucus. They support Kyoto to appease their New Democratic agenda despite the fact that Kyoto is mostly cosmetic . . . is more cosmetic than a meaningful strategy that would be vital to the environment of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting the motion. I will, however, support the amendment put forth by the hon. member from Thunder Creek. Thank you.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm . . .

The Speaker: — Order. Why is the member for Last Mountain-Touchwood on his feet?

Mr. Hart: — Leave to introduce guests, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Hart: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member from Saskatoon for yielding. Mr. Speaker, seated in your gallery are four . . . five very special people in my life, my wife Marlene, who's been here many times before, and with her is our daughter Charmane, and three of our grandchildren, Mr. Speaker. Our oldest granddaughter Shelby is with . . . accompanying Marlene and Charmane, our grandson, Owen, and Charmane's daughter, Tenaisha who is celebrating a very special day, Mr. Speaker. She's celebrating her sixth birthday.

Grandma took the grandchildren out for a movie and supper, and then they came to see Grandpa work, as they refer to the legislature, in Grandpa's big office. So I'd ask all members to welcome them, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion Under Rule 46

Kyoto Protocol (continued)

Mr. Prebble: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and a warm welcome to our guests in the gallery.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to enter into this important debate this evening on the Kyoto Protocol. And I want to . . . I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, that I am pleased that the Kyoto Protocol has been ratified by the Government of Canada because I'm a supporter of the Kyoto Protocol, and I make no bones about that, Mr. Speaker.

But I'm also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our government is taking a clear stand on the principles that are required for proper implementation of the Kyoto Protocol to ensure that its implementation is going to be fair to the province of Saskatchewan. And that's what the motion that we're debating this evening is in large part about.

But we're also having a historic debate on the wisdom of ratifying Kyoto with the Saskatchewan Party opposition taking a strong stand in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that stand by the Saskatchewan Party and by their partners in Ottawa, the Canadian Alliance, will go down, Mr. Speaker, as a shameful stand — a shameful stand, Mr. Speaker — in light of the evidence that currently exists on the reality of global warming and the obvious need for the planet to act to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

And clearly what the Saskatchewan Party is saying tonight, Mr. Speaker, is that they are ignoring the reality of global warming. They're like ostriches putting their heads in the sand, Mr. Speaker. And they are saying, Mr. Speaker, they are saying that the economy, the economy must come first under all circumstances regardless of what's happening to the environment of our planet, Mr. Speaker.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Saskatchewan Party is ignoring the evidence that's been put forward by thousands of reputable climatologists around the world, Mr. Speaker — not the climatologists that are working for the oil industry or the coal industry. I'm sure that the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, can find a few scientists who are prepared to question whether global warming is occurring. But, Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. The international scientific community is virtually unanimous around the world about the evidence of global warming. And the Saskatchewan Party is choosing to ignore that evidence, Mr. Speaker. And I think that is very telling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a moment about the Protocol itself so that there's clarity about the Protocol and about Canada's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, because as the member for Saskatoon Idylwyld said, Canada contributes between 2 to 3 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. And I heard the Saskatchewan Party member for Humboldt say, Mr. Speaker, that Canada's contribution to global warming was very insignificant and that therefore it didn't matter what Canada did.

Well I say, Mr. Speaker, it matters a great deal what Canada and Saskatchewan do. First of all, Mr. Speaker, Canada is the ninth largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in the entire world. So what we do is very important, Mr. Speaker. What our nation decides to do is very important.

Secondly, we have an international reputation of setting an example for the right course of action to take, Mr. Speaker, in the world; and I believe that Canada is taking the right course of action. And I believe that Saskatchewan should set an example in North America of what can be done in a cost-effective way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and create new job opportunities for people in this province at the same time, Mr. Speaker. And that's one of the goals that I hold out as we examine this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also want to update the residents of this province on where we stand now in terms of countries that are signed up for ratification because the Saskatchewan Party likes to make it sound like no one else is joining in, Mr. Speaker. Well I'm pleased to inform members of the Assembly that as of the middle of November — November 13, to be exact — 97 countries had ratified or acceded to the Kyoto Protocol, Mr.

Speaker. And in terms of the developed nations that have signed, Mr. Speaker, they now account for 37.4 per cent of greenhouse gas emissions in the world, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Protocol will effectively kick in and become a legal . . . a legally binding treaty when countries that represent 55 per cent of the world's greenhouse emissions sign, Mr. Speaker. So at this point, Mr. Speaker, we need another 18 per cent for Kyoto to be legally binding. Canada's 2 per cent will be an important contribution to this process, Mr. Speaker. Russia's 17 per cent — if Russia ratifies, which I believe it will — will take us over the top in terms of what's needed by the worldwide community in terms of nations who represent at least 55 per cent of global greenhouse emissions making a commitment to the Protocol, Mr. Speaker. And I'm pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that we are making progress in terms of nations signing up — significant progress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the next point that I want to address is the environmental implications of not signing the Kyoto Protocol and the economic implications of not signing the Kyoto Protocol, as the members from the Saskatchewan Party are suggesting that we ought not to be supporting the Protocol. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to begin in this regard to say that in my mind Kyoto is just a beginning in terms of what we need to do on a global basis to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

And that's why, Mr. Speaker, there should be no substantial debate about whether we at least want to get started. Surely we ought to all agree that we at least want to get started, Mr. Speaker, and I'll explain why in a moment.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that what we're going to find within the next decade is that we don't need to talk about just reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 25 per cent in a Canadian context — which is 6 per cent below 1990 levels — 25 per cent reduction by the year 2012. But I think by the time we reach 2012 we'll have to be looking at much deeper reductions. Many, many scientists around the world are saying that a 50 to 60 per cent reduction in emissions will be required.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a few of the . . . some of the consequences of global warming and why I believe that it is imperative that we proceed with the Protocol.

For Saskatchewan many of the costs, Mr. Speaker, are already becoming very apparent in the form of severe drought, declining crop production, increased forest fires, sharply increased forest firefighting expenditures, declining surface water levels, and the threat of West Nile virus. These are all realities, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, that we have experienced in the last three years in Saskatchewan. And the Saskatchewan Party member for Rosthern says this is fearmongering and, Mr. Speaker, I say this is a reality that every Saskatchewan resident knows is happening in Saskatchewan right now, Mr. Speaker, right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the implications of global warming are . . . have very serious implications for the future of our farm economy, our northern forest, our surface water bodies, and our recreational and

tourism industry. And these industries could be significantly jeopardized if global warming is not checked. These consequences are just the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

We also risk the escalation of tropical diseases into Western Canada, unbearably hot summers and the premature deaths that will result from those kinds of summers, Mr. Speaker. We risk a significant loss of aquatic species in our province and in our nation — serious damage to our sports fishing industry. It's very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the scientific community is telling Saskatchewan residents and Canadians that global warming will result in more tornadoes and other extreme weather events and the melting of glaciers in the Canadian Rockies upon which Saskatchewan rivers ultimately rely.

Our actions, Mr. Speaker, also impact on the rest of Canada and on every other country in the world. The cost of global warming will include more typhoons and hurricanes, the loss of habitat for thousands of species, the destruction of our coral reefs around the world, melting permafrost in Canada and other northern regions, rising sea levels, Mr. Speaker, and coastal flooding that threatens island states and many of the world's cities.

And, Mr. Speaker, my question to the members of the Saskatchewan Party is, in the face of this evidence being put forward by the international scientific community, how can they possibly put forward a resolution saying that we should go slow in terms of taking action on global warming and oppose Kyoto? And I say shame on them, Mr. Speaker, shame on them.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

(20:00)

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the negative consequences of global warming are enormous and far outweigh costs that will be associated with mitigating it. The negative economic impacts of global warming are the primary reason the insurance industry worldwide has been solidly on the side of those backing Kyoto.

And I say to members of the Saskatchewan Party, if you want to see a private business that is adamant about Kyoto, well take a look at the insurance industry worldwide, Mr. Speaker, who've been standing beside Greenpeace saying that Kyoto should just be the beginning; we need to do a lot more. That's been the position of the insurance industry. And the members opposite are shaking their heads, Mr. Speaker. They should read *The Globe and Mail* more regularly.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prebble: — Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that while the economic issues are very important, I believe the essence of the Kyoto debate is around the ethical choices that impact enormously on human health and the health of the planet. At the heart of the matter is whether we are prepared to take truly substantial steps in a cost-effective and creative way to lighten our ecological footprint on the planet. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that more and more Canadians are saying yes to that question, Mr. Speaker.

Now I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that a strategy in support of Kyoto can be a profitable and a cost-effective strategy and one that creates many new employment opportunities. I would like to provide members of the Assembly with four examples. The first two, Mr. Speaker, are outside of Saskatchewan.

The first example is the city of Toronto. It has achieved greenhouse gas reductions in its municipal operations of 67 per cent. Toronto has set up a revolving fund to facilitate energy conservation retrofits and has achieved much of its reduction by capturing the methane gas from landfill operations and using it as a source of energy.

The second example involves the case of British Petroleum, and members opposite should listen to this. This is a major transnational energy corporation, Mr. Speaker. British Petroleum decided a few years ago to meet the Kyoto target and I'm pleased to report it's already done so. Moreover, it has already achieved financial savings which more than offset its initial investment. British Petroleum achieved the targets at a cost of \$150 million and estimates it has achieved savings of over \$400 million. British Petroleum has no intention of stopping. It's now moving into solar energy in a big way and is converting more than 300 service stations around the world to solar power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a third example that I want to give is an example that's already underway in this province in terms of what we're doing in Saskatchewan to promote energy efficiency in the home, because our government a year ago introduced the prime rate loan program that's available over a five-year period to assist homeowners who want to install an energy-efficient furnace in their house.

And interestingly, Mr. Speaker, we've now had 5,000 people, more than 5,000 Saskatchewan residents have taken advantage of this program, Mr. Speaker. And on average they've each saved 2.2 tonnes of carbon dioxide a year in terms of reduced emissions from their house by doing this, Mr. Speaker — well beyond the target that the Government of Canada has set of a 1-tonne reduction in emissions for each resident.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, do you know what? The average resident has saved \$315 a year in their energy bill by taking this action, Mr. Speaker. And that's just a little example of how practising good environmental practices is also good economics in the household. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's just one little example.

Mr. Speaker, a second example of what we're doing. We have . . . We've just installed 17 megawatts of wind power in this province in two separate wind power projects down in Gull Lake. And, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be the equivalent of eliminating the emissions . . . for providing 7,000 homes in this province with electricity, Mr. Speaker, 7,000 homes. That's just another practical example of what can be done and Saskatchewan residents are excited about it.

And one of the obvious things we can do in Saskatchewan in terms of meeting our greenhouse gas emission reduction targets is more wind power, Mr. Speaker, a lot more wind power in this province. And this government under this Premier has announced that it's now seriously exploring, not just 17

megawatts of wind power in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, but 150 more megawatts of wind power in this province are now under serious exploration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have a short time left but I do want to give a couple more examples of practical energy conservation and what it can mean in terms of reduced greenhouse gas emissions. And my argument, Mr. Speaker, is that a lot of the capital costs that are needed to meet our Kyoto targets can be achieved through practical energy conservation investments with the capital costs being paid for by the energy savings, Mr. Speaker.

Just as a little example of this, I want to note that our government has just finished retrofitting eight schools in the North Battleford area for the Catholic school division there. The capital costs were \$685,000; the savings are \$63,000 a year. The entire cost of this project including the interest, Mr. Speaker, is going to be paid for by the energy savings in just 11 years. And I believe we can replicate that again and again and again around Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker.

We've just done it in the city of Regina with seven facilities. We've just done it in the constituency of the member for Rosthern with an investment in the 18 schools in the Saskatchewan Valley School Division, and that investment is going to pay for itself in energy savings in just a decade and will reduce energy consumption in those schools by 25 per cent, Mr. Speaker. That's an example of how Kyoto can be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up but I just want to say that I'm proud of the stand that this government is taking in opposition to the Saskatchewan Party's amendment that Kyoto be opposed. We are standing, Mr. Speaker, in support of the principles and objectives of the Protocol, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that we will also stand firm in terms of negotiating a fair position that protects the interests of the Saskatchewan economy and all Saskatchewan residents.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hermanson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise in the Assembly and speak on the motion today. I want to inform the House that I will be supporting the amendment, but cannot support the original motion because it does not clearly oppose the Kyoto Protocol.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is not a debate about being environmentally responsible. It's not a debate about conserving energy. Obviously if that was the debate, we would be in favour of any motion. The Saskatchewan Party recognizes that we all, as citizens on this globe, have an environmental responsibility. We all recognize that we need to be prudent with the resources that we have been blessed with.

But the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Kyoto Protocol, the Kyoto accord, is a flawed agreement. It's an impossible agreement, Mr. Speaker. If in fact those countries that sign on to the Kyoto Protocol abide by the rules in the Protocol, the chances of greenhouse gas emissions increasing is extremely large and the globe will be troubled by more greenhouse gases,

not fewer greenhouse gases, because the whole concept behind the Kyoto Protocol is that those countries that aren't able to meet their commitments will have to pay money to those countries that have room, that have credit, because they have not reached their emission levels. And so they will take that money and build up their industries. Countries like Russia will build up their industries and in fact produce more greenhouse gases while the countries that can't keep the commitments are also above their levels of greenhouse gas emissions.

It's very clear — Kyoto cannot work. But yet members on the other side, including the fanatical presentation by the member who preceded me, are heard from that side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, our own Premier has been weak in dealing with the Kyoto Protocol. He has said . . . it is said in the *Leader-Post*: "Kyoto, Calvert says get used to it." Another *Leader-Post* article, editorial, says the province must speak out. And it says:

Saskatchewan's Industry and Resources minister, Eldon Lautermilch, suggests that the federal government's plan to ratify the Kyoto accord by December is effectively dead.

Reacting to the cancellation of next week's meeting of energy and environment officials at which the federal government was to reveal its blueprint for Kyoto, Lautermilch said, "The December ratification is not on. The timeframe is not realistic."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the ratification occurred today in the Parliament of Canada. So the Minister of Industry and Resources was wrong. He was absolutely inaccurate in saying that the December ratification was not on. So we simply cannot trust our key point person in the government on this file. Well the editorial goes on to say that:

This week the province released a softly worded position paper on Kyoto. Given Ottawa's recent behaviour, it must do more. At the very least it must make it clear that Premier Lorne Calvert's demand last month that Ottawa provide a detailed plan for Kyoto before proceeding with ratification is not negotiable. Better yet would be an announcement that the province will use all of the means at its disposal, including a court challenge, to fight any unilateral federal attempt to proceed with ratification.

Well obviously, Mr. Speaker, our Premier has not taken a strong stand in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol. And that's quite a contrast to the leaders of other provinces who have had opportunities to speak on this issue. Of course we all expected Premier Klein to take a role in opposition to Kyoto and he's done that very effectively. He's been a leader in the provinces in opposing Kyoto.

But it was interesting to read an editorial in the *National Post* written by the premiers of British Columbia and Newfoundland, the far western province and the far eastern province of this country, speaking out against the Kyoto Protocol. Now the title on the editorial was "Challenging Kyoto From West to East." It's just unfortunate that that challenge wasn't throughout the country and in fact also challenged here in the province of Saskatchewan.

But that didn't happen. The Premier of Ontario has spoken out against the Kyoto Protocol, and his province has taken a position against Kyoto because obviously the auto industry, which employs hundreds of thousands of people, is at risk if Kyoto is approved. But here in Saskatchewan, where industries like agriculture, our resource-based industries, are hanging in the balance, IPSCO is hanging in the balance, where is the Premier of Saskatchewan? Mute on the issue. He's not speaking strongly on one side of the fence or the other. At least the member for Saskatoon Greystone had an opinion and spoke out loud — as misguided and ridiculous as it was. At least we know where he stands.

But where's the Premier of Saskatchewan? Well one day he says he's modestly or slightly predisposed to support Kyoto. And the next day, he says, well slightly, maybe a little bit off in opposition to Kyoto. No strong position, whatsoever. That kind of leadership is not good for the province of Saskatchewan.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem that the NDP (New Democratic Party) have, of course, is that they're so terribly divided. In fact there's more MLAs, MPs (Member of Parliament), party members that strongly support Kyoto than have the common sense to oppose the agreement.

I found just an interesting debate from *Hansard* in the House of Commons, and this is a speech given by Mr. Pat Martin, NDP MP for Winnipeg Centre, and this is a real beauty, Mr. Speaker. He starts out by saying:

We have not been thinking outside the box.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this boy is not thinking outside the box. I don't think he's even on the planet. This is what he said, and I quote, Mr. Speaker:

I sometimes think the worst thing that happened in western Canada was Leduc No. 1, in 1947, when they struck oil in Leduc, Alberta. It was regressive. I almost wish the world would run out of oil more quickly so that we still have some air left to breathe by the time we find alternative fuel and energy sources. That would be my first wish. Ban the internal combustion engine as a radical idea.

Well, believe me, Mr. Speaker, that is a radical idea. That's a Member of Parliament from the party represented across the floor. What would thinking like this do to industry in Saskatchewan? What would this do to the agriculture sector? It would shut down every farm. They'd be back to the horse and buggy days, Mr. Speaker. I cannot believe that their federal counterparts would make such ridiculous statements as the one I just read.

(20:15)

I have other information that I don't have time to relay to the House, but one of their leadership contenders, Mr. Bill Blaikie, is in support of the Kyoto Protocol; in fact, I think all of their leadership — federal leadership contenders — are in support of the protocol. Here I have a column by Dick Proctor, NDP MP here in Saskatchewan, and he's commenting on Kyoto. He says:

Mr. Chrétien wants to change the agreement unilaterally by

allowing Canada to claim credits for clean natural gas exports to the United States. That's part of our emission reduction plan.

Well you know, Mr. Chrétien has not carried the ball very well on this but at least that sounds like a little better proposal. But what does Mr. Proctor say? He says:

Nice try, except it isn't allowed under the Kyoto Protocol.

Mr. Speaker, our own Saskatchewan NDP MP is supporting the Kyoto Protocol agreement even though it would be very damaging to our industries and our people of this province.

We're a cold province; we need heat. I don't know if the members on the other side plan on turning their thermostats down below freezing. I'm not sure if they plan on . . . if the member from Meadow Lake plans to walk back and forth between Regina and Meadow Lake. I haven't got quite figured out what their thinking is, but it certainly isn't going to work.

As alarming, Mr. Speaker, as the NDP position is on the Kyoto Protocol, I guess based on some of their history and some of their beliefs, we could expect this kind of a radical response. But you would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party would respond in a more responsible fashion, but we have the . . . just as alarming a work coming out of the provincial Leader of the Liberal Party here in this province, or as I like to call it, the Karwacki party, because many of the Liberals have already joined the Saskatchewan Party and there aren't too many left. There are at least a couple of Karwackis left in that party.

But Mr. Karwacki is quoted as saying that Kyoto should be signed, that the agreement should be signed. He has said that he wants to see the Kyoto accord in Saskatchewan's future.

Now this is the guy, Mr. Speaker, that goes out and buys a Yukon to drive — a gas guzzler, 12 miles to the gallon, I think, is what it gets — and he gets a bad news story, Mr. Speaker; he gets a bad news story so what does he do? Well you think he'd go and he'd buy a Volkswagen diesel or something. But no. Mr. Karwacki goes back to the dealer, trades off his Yukon for another Yukon. The only difference is that he has to go to Ottawa with his Yukon to fill it up with the right kind of fuel, a more environmentally friendly fuel, a higher blend of ethanol.

This is a guy that wants to be . . . put signs up all over Saskatchewan saying that, look at me, I'm a leader. And he can't even get the automobile that he drives right? Mr. Speaker, the NDP are an embarrassment, but we kind of expect them to be an embarrassment to the province. But we expect better of the Liberals and the provincial Liberals here in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the Hon. Ralph Goodale, the Liberal minister responsible for Saskatchewan, speak in favour of Kyoto. And I've got to admit that I had thought a bit about the old national energy policy when I first heard about Kyoto, but I hadn't quite decided whether the two could be compared until I heard Mr. Goodale. And I heard him on a news interview — could've been an open line show — say about four or five times in the space of about two or three minutes that the Kyoto Protocol is not another national energy program. You know he

kept repeating it until I began to believe that he wasn't telling me the truth and in fact it was similar to the national energy program — that it would be destructive to the oil and gas industry in Western Canada, that it would be harmful to the taxpayers in this province, that it would cost even more jobs than they're projecting that it would cost.

Let's remember that this idea of supporting the Kyoto Protocol is being led by a federal party that not only introduced a national energy program, but also the gun registry and we know what a wreck it's in right now. Now they are the ones that take all of this gas tax revenue out of Saskatchewan and don't put anything back into our highways.

They are the same folks that can't manage the GST (goods and services tax) and we've got all this fraudulent, all these fraudulent issues surrounding the GST, again hundreds of millions, perhaps \$1 billion. And they are also the folks that said that we would be keeping the Crow and then suddenly introduced the end of the Crow rate, the Crow benefit, without putting a proper replacement in place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support the amendment because unlike the NDP motion, it clearly opposes the Kyoto Protocol. You know, the NDP are not being honest with the people of Saskatchewan when they suggest on the one hand you can support Kyoto if these 12 principles are adhered to because, quite simply, Kyoto and those 12 principles are incompatible. You cannot sign the Kyoto Protocol and live up to those 12 principles. It's simply impossible. But it hasn't got into their heads yet, because like the member for Saskatoon Greystone, they're just in another world. Like the MP from Winnipeg, they haven't got their act together, Mr. Speaker.

The Saskatchewan Party amendment clearly indicates that we must oppose, oppose the Kyoto Protocol. It's time that we saw more resolve on the other side. The Minister of Industry and Resources has on occasion been speaking against the Kyoto Protocol. He's the point person, he's the only person that apparently understands the damage that could be caused to our province, to our economy, if in fact this agreement is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be men and women of leadership, men and women that put the well-being of the province first. It's time that people in leadership positions, it's time that MLAs on that side of the House began to call a spade a spade. If they're prepared to sacrifice, if they're prepared to sacrifice this province's national resources industries, if they're prepared to sacrifice agriculture, if they're prepared to sacrifice our standing of . . . our standard of living, let them say so and then support the Kyoto Protocol. But we cannot be of two minds. We cannot be saying that on one hand we can support Kyoto, and on the other hand that our lot in life will be better. That's simply not a tangible, reasonable position to take.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear that we're not getting leadership from the NDP, both federally and provincially. It's clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal government in Ottawa has not considered the province's situation. It's clear that they don't recognize the damage that would be caused to Saskatchewan's economy if the agreement is carried out.

Now, Mr. Karwacki, the leader of the Karwacki party says, let's just sign it and if there's damage to Saskatchewan's economy, we'll ask the federal government to compensate us for it. What are the chances, Mr. Speaker, of the federal government in Ottawa — this Liberal government that won't put any money, invest any money into our roads, won't invest money into our health care and we've heard lots about that from the other side — what are the chances of the federal Liberal government in Ottawa making up the shortfall that we experience if we sign on to the Kyoto Protocol and our economy is hurt? Who's going to make up for the jobs that are lost? Can we count on Ottawa to do that, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so. I don't think we can trust Mr. Karwacki on this file.

We obviously can't trust the member for Saskatoon Greystone on this file. The Premier's not taken a position, he's waffled on this issue terribly, and none of the NDP caucus is listening to the Minister of Industry and Resources when he does sound the alarm bells, which is not often enough.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Party has been clear. We are prepared to do our part to be environmentally responsible, but we do that, Mr. Speaker, by having a strong economy. We do that by having the resources, by having the financial wherewithal to provide cleaner . . . a cleaner environment to produce less greenhouse gases. Mr. Speaker, what's going to happen if this Protocol is agreed to is that while we are fiscally handicapped the Americans are going to steal our business because they're not signing on to the Protocol. They're going to continue to take more of our young people, provide more jobs, improve their standard of living, reduce their emission of greenhouse gases, and we here in Saskatchewan are going to be the sufferers. We are going to be the third-class citizens, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask the NDP to have another look at the motion and the amendment. Both the motion and the amendment adhere to those 12 principles. We agree. The Deputy Premier acknowledges that we agree on the 12 principles. They're in our amendment; they're in the NDP motion. The only problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP motion does not clearly indicate that to keep those 12 principles, to hold to those 12 principles, we must oppose the Kyoto accord and the Kyoto Protocol.

That is the flaw in their thinking, Mr. Speaker. The Saskatchewan Party is committed to opposing Kyoto and providing a cleaner environment by providing our people of Saskatchewan with the resources to take care of themselves. That's a concept that's alien to the NDP; they just don't get it. Mr. Speaker, we hope that in the next few months, and hopefully it will be this spring, the people of Saskatchewan will get a chance to express their opinion on the Kyoto Protocol.

Polling shows that three-quarters of Saskatchewan people, or two-thirds at least, oppose the Kyoto Protocol. In spite of that, this government that's supposed to be representing the people of Saskatchewan have put forward a motion in support of Kyoto. That flies in the face of the opinion of Saskatchewan people. Mr. Speaker, it's another reason why when that election does occur, the Saskatchewan Party will be elected and we will represent the best interests of Saskatchewan people. We will grow the province and we will provide a good environment for

Saskatchewan people. Thank you very much.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Addley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to be able to rise in this House. It's a great honour to be able to participate in debate that in hindsight may end up being one of the more important debates that we have in this legislature in the last three years and perhaps in the years to come. So I'm honoured to be able to participate in that.

Now at the outside I will be letting you know that I am going to be supporting the government's motion and be opposing the opposition's motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is an undeniable fact that the globe is warming. That is an undeniable fact. I don't think that anybody in this legislature or any of the scientists around the world would say that it is not.

Now the question is, is whether or not this warming is actually natural. Now it has been said that some of the ways that the globe has warmed up is the proximity of the earth to the sun, that it is natural over the years for the earth to get closer to the sun and therefore warm up or get further from the sun and therefore cool down. That's one of the things.

There's also graphs that I've seen, Mr. Speaker, that show that the strength of the sun and how hot the sun is, is also reflected to whether or not the globe has warmed up over the years and whether it has cooled down or not.

A third possibility is that the tilt of the earth has an impact on whether or not . . . I mean and that's basically how our seasons occur in northern . . . in Canada basically — that when the earth is tilted away from the sun that it's colder; when the earth is tilted towards the sun, then it's warmer.

Now one of the things though is that it is very clear too in the last 150 years, and in particular the last 50 years, that this natural warming cycle that we are now in has been exacerbated by the addition of CO₂ into the atmosphere by humankind. Now that is an undeniable fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must as an aside say last week I was able to judge a series of debates in Saskatoon. In Walter Murray Collegiate there was a debate of grade 12 students and I was one of the judges. And the topic that they were debating was should Canada support or ratify the Kyoto accord. Now it was an interesting debate, especially from my perspective because as a judge, I was actually able to give my feedback on what I thought of the debates. Usually when I'm sitting in the chair in the legislature here, I don't get to judge the debates. Fortunately you're not able to judge the debate right now, Mr. Speaker, and I'm quite pleased about that.

So it's an undeniable fact that the globe is warming. The question is, what does that mean? And what are we going to do about it? Now some of the things that it does mean is that in Canada there will be an impact on agriculture and on forestry.

Now as members know, I'm originally from northern Saskatchewan, in Loon Lake, and that's about two hours north

of North Battleford. I remember growing up, travelling from North Battleford to Loon Lake when I was a small child, and there was all these signs at each community as you went further and further north. And it would always say, gateway to the northern forest. And every town that you came along there was no northern forest.

(20:30)

And what had happened was that in the settlement of Saskatchewan and western Canada that there'd been some deforestation. And that is as a result of the agriculture . . . you know, Saskatchewan is one of the largest topographical changes . . . one of the largest unnatural environments with the advent of farming. Where there used to be natural prairie and natural forest, that is generally gone. And that's something most people in Saskatchewan who've grown up here aren't aware of.

Now we do have some options. The two extremes are, we can ban fossil fuels completely tomorrow; we could say there will be no more fossil fuels burning, and that will completely take care of the CO₂ problem. Very quickly we'll stabilize the planet. Whether or not that will do any good, that's another question. But what we do know is that it will stop the economic engine of Canada and of the world. Once that occurs, then the standard of living in the population across the world will go down quite quickly.

Now if the goal of stopping global warming is to better mankind and better the planet, banning fossil fuels tomorrow will not solve that because the economic difficulties that will create, the health difficulties that will create, will be worse than what global warming would have been. We would have been better off to take that money and invest it in adapting to global warming.

The other extreme is to do absolutely nothing and to adapt to what global warming means. And just a short list: we could start developing technology to build dikes around North America, around some of the low lying areas. We could, in the next 50 years, plan to move island populations as their islands generally flood. We could also change our farming practices, making sure that we plant earlier and handle the drought season, and develop different agrarian practices so that we can handle the extremes in precipitation.

Now I don't think that's very realistic either. I don't think that's being good stewards of this planet. So I suspect or my position is that we should have a balance. We should have a balance of either banning fossil fuels or doing nothing. And I think that our motion, if the federal government would follow what our plan is here in Saskatchewan . . . and we've been advocates in a whole lot of different areas unrelated to global warming. Medicare is probably the one that we're most famous with, and our former premier Romanow has just delivered a package that will hopefully improve medicare for the next 50 years.

But if the federal government had listened to Saskatchewan and had adapted or had followed what we had suggested, I think they would find a balanced, reasonable approach to the problem of global warming.

Now so we could reduce what we need to do and adapt

basically what needs to happen for us to follow through with our plan to solve global warming. Now there are different ways of approaching it but that's what our proposal's talking about, is dealing with that.

Now one of the readings that I've seen is that the cost of global warming in a dollar and cents . . . is approximately \$5 trillion. And that's what the cost of global warming would be. Now we could take some of that money and instead of just throw it away on global warming, we could take that and invest it into some new technologies. Now there's ways of the carrot-and-stick approach that you tax the worst offenders and take that money and roll it back into new technologies and development. But I think we need to start moving fairly quickly.

Now I'm one of those folks that believes that the goals of Kyoto are appropriate, that we need to reduce global warming. I don't think we need to wait for the science. I think it's just the right thing to do that we don't need to change . . . I mean I was raised as a Boy Scout and one of the things they say is that the way you find a place is the way that you should leave it. If you go out camping in the wilderness, you should not be able to tell that a person had been there. I think that's been referred to earlier as the human footprint.

Now the member for Greystone has outlined very clearly some of the catastrophic possibilities that have happened or that could happen with global warming. And I'd just like to say that the radical member for Greystone, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, is in a pretty good company.

And I'd just like to quote something briefly, and this is how the quote goes. This is what will happen if we do not change our ways.

The polar ice caps will melt more rapidly; sea levels will rise; you will have the danger of flooding in places like the . . . Florida Everglades . . . the sugarcane fields of Louisiana; island nations could literally be buried. The whole climate of (North America — I'm paraphrasing here) . . . for example, could be changed where you (could) . . . have more flooding, more heat waves, more storms, more extreme weather events generally.

And then you'll have some public health consequences. For example, (we've already seen) . . . in Africa, for example, malaria being found at higher and higher altitudes where it used to be too cool for the mosquitoes.

So there will be a lot of very bad, more dramatic weather events. There will be a shift in the patterns of agricultural production. There will be flooding that will be quite bad, and there will be more public health crises.

Well now the member for Cannington says that sounds rather Biblical, and I think he'll be laughing when he hears who said that. It was former president, Bill Clinton. But I appreciate . . . now he may say that they might need a Bible, but we won't go there . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I won't. Anyway, back to my prepared remarks.

An Hon. Member: — Sorry for distracting you.

Mr. Addley: — That's no problem, hon. member.

Now CO₂ is just one of the many gases that are impacted on global warming: methane — laughing gas, which I think we've seen lots tonight — CFCs (chlorofluorocarbon) and ozone. Now mankind is responsible . . . 80 per cent is from burning fuels, and 20 per cent is the deforestation of the world. Now 50 per cent of that additional CO₂ has been absorbed into the oceans and into the regrowing of the forest, but 31 per cent has been into the atmosphere.

Now I mentioned that we are presently in the Holocene era that began 10,000 years ago. Now there have been eight cycles of warming and cooling since that time. Now the difficulty is, are we in the middle of a warming trend naturally, or is this entirely due to global warming that has been caused by mankind? Most of the science that I've witnessed or that I've read indicates that it is part of just a natural time of the cycle, but there is an additional addition to that natural cycle that is clearly caused by mankind and that we need to adapt to that.

Now regardless of whether or not mankind has caused this, we will have to adapt or have to deal with the cost of global changes and the global warming. Now we've all heard about the problems with the hole in the ozone layer. Now because of the banning of CFCs and all of the changes and the adaptations that we've done in the last 20 years or so, the ozone layer is rebuilding itself, and the hole is shrinking. So we can have a positive impact on the climate if we set our mind to it.

Now agriculture, the cost to agriculture currently would be 11 to 20 per cent reduction in the world's cereal production. And I don't need to tell the hon. members opposite what kind of impact that will have economically to our farming community, but as importantly and perhaps more importantly, to feeding the people in the world.

Now my position on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the federal government and why I support our motion and do not support the opposition's amendment, is that the difficulty is whether or not the cost to implement will be shared equally.

Now we all know that Canada is . . . one of the important components of Canada is agriculture. Saskatchewan accounts for almost 50 per cent of agriculture in Canada. We have 30 . . . 3 per cent of the population. And, unfortunately, the way the federal government approaches things is that it's unfairly penalizing Saskatchewan because we have so much agriculture.

So when we need to battle the treasuries of the US and the treasuries of Europe, they say Saskatchewan has to pay almost 50 per cent of the cost. Well, that's not fair, Mr. Speaker, and that's my concern is that the federal government say . . . may say, Saskatchewan, you will have to pay your share of the global warming price tag.

Now the difficulty is that in Manitoba, they built dams and in Quebec as well, and they gain a large amount of their power from hydroelectricity. There is no CO₂ emissions from that generation. In Saskatchewan a large part of our electricity is derived from coal burning.

Now is it better to burn coal and put CFCs in the atmosphere

than to dam a river and completely change an ecosystem? That's for some other experts than me to decide that, but there are impacts to the environment that have gone on by having hydroelectric power that is different than the . . . than just releasing CO₂ into the atmosphere . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fifty minutes. Okay.

Now what do we do? Well, I think we have to ask some very hard questions. For example — and this is from the sceptical environmentalists measuring the real state of the world and I think they come across with a fairly balanced approach — how much effect does CO₂ have on temperature? Could there be other causes behind increasing temperature? Are the greenhouse gas scenarios reasonable? What are the consequences of a possible temperature increase? What are the costs of curbing versus not curbing CO₂ emissions? And I think that's an important point that members of the opposition haven't taken to account.

They've outlined some pretty scary scenarios should we implement Kyoto and the cost of implementing Kyoto be borne largely by Saskatchewan alone, but we also have to look at the cost of doing nothing. And I think that is what hasn't been talked about here tonight by members of the opposition. And how should we choose what to do?

I think that the opposition . . . pardon me, the federal Liberal government in Ottawa has chosen, rightly so, as pointed out by members on this side and members on the other side, that Prime Minister Chrétien is looking for a stamp or basically a way to show that he's an environmentalist, and this was a quick and easy way to do. But I think what we need to do is to not use this as a stepping stone for political projects — either this government or members of the opposition or the federal Liberal government. I think the issue is too important to be delved into or to be utilized just for crass, political gain.

Now there are price tags to adapt to Kyoto. Some of the discussions have been that it will cost approximately 2 per cent of output for one year. Now that's important, and that may sound like a lot of money, but the way one group words it is that in 2051, we will be as well off as a country and as a world population as we would have been in 2050. So we delay our economic benefits for one year in a 50-year time frame. I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but I think that's affordable, if we're actually going to change the world . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Now the member for Cannington points out how costly it would be to have this government in for 60 more years, but I wonder how costly it would be for the members if they were in power for any of those years.

Now I think the most important point from my perspective is not to play politics with the issue, but how can we make this work. How can we make this work? Now implementing Kyoto will help the farming community in Saskatchewan. Implementing Kyoto will hurt the oil patch if it's not done correctly, Mr. Speaker. And I think our plan does that. I think we need to have a balanced approach, a rational approach.

Members of the opposition said that Y2K was a fraud; it was a sham. Well another way to look at it is that by raising the alarm bells early and investing the money that needed to, there was no impact, thereby proving that we can have an impact on . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask members to consider something else. Imagine, if you will, if the problem wasn't global warming but global cooling. What would we do? We would think, now how could we increase the amount of CO₂? We would have to try to get a global warming effect going. We would be trying to reduce vegetation. We would be saying . . . but then the members of the opposition would be saying what? They're asking us to burn more fossil fuels; do you know how much expense that'll be to burn fossil fuels? And so I just raised that just as a different perspective on how things . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's a different manner; that's true.

Now I guess to conclude, I want to say that we can handle this, Mr. Speaker. There is a problem. Global warming is coming down the pipe. But we need to have cooler heads — pardon the pun. We have to have cooler heads prevail, and I'm doing my part . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I just thought that up, Ken . . . pardon me — member.

(20:45)

But I look at the competing motions. We have . . . the Government of Saskatchewan is proposing a motion that endorses a plan to deal with global warming. It outlines the 12 points that were unanimously supported by all provinces and all territories, and we can have a united front to deal with that.

When you look at the amendment that the opposition has put out, it is talking about slogans. It's talking about made in Saskatchewan, made in Canada. Well this is a made-in-Saskatchewan, made-in-Canada plan that our government is proposing, and we will deal with global warming in a balanced, rational, and respectful way, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the radical way and divisive way that some members of the opposition have put forward.

So to that end, Mr. Speaker, I see my time is coming to an end, and I would like to just go on record as saying it's been an honour to participate in the debate, and I will be supporting the government motion and not supporting the amendment put forward by the opposition. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while we have been listening in the course of this debate to the members of the government speak, I hear the Saskatchewan Party saying that we are hearing from the loopy left. And while we have been listening to the members from the Saskatchewan Party enter the debate, I hear the government call out that we are hearing from the extremist right. So I thought all members would appreciate a moment to listen to the quiet voice of moderation and common sense.

If I may say, Mr. Speaker . . . I say it modestly, Mr. Speaker, that I consider myself somewhat of an expert on Kyoto, as I believe I am the only MLA who has visited that city. So I do consider myself somewhat of an expert on Kyoto. In fact I even know how to pronounce it, and I may say to hon. members, it's not kiato, it's not coyote; it is Kyoto. And it is a beautiful city, and it is the cultural capital of Japan and the ancient imperial capital.

Well in fact, Mr. Speaker, I've not only visited Kyoto; I've also visited Alberta. I was present in the Alberta legislature for their Kyoto debate and I must say that that was very instructive and interesting.

But, Mr. Speaker, while some of the speakers today have portrayed this as a great battle of diametrically opposed principles, I think it is fair to say that all of us understand that there is no question as to the direction which history is moving. And I do not think there is anybody in this House who can seriously argue against the need to reduce CO₂ emissions, the need to move into ethanol, bio-diesel, energy efficient furnaces, more energy efficient homes and windows, and the need for more fuel-efficient vehicles.

Well most of our reservations though clearly revolve around the fact that at present we are the only country in the western hemisphere to ratify Kyoto and that, of course, includes our major trading partner and closest neighbour, the United States.

And I must admit that I have some concern that we must be careful not to destroy our competitive position vis-à-vis United States and the rest of the world by virtue of ratifying Kyoto, and I think this resolution directly addresses that.

We know that we are responsible for only 2 per cent of the world's CO₂ emissions. We also know that the Third World has been exempted from following the Kyoto Protocol. Now this may be fair in a sense of political correctness or of economic fairness. But frankly, it is nonsense in terms of the Kyoto Protocol itself because by all projections, China and India will be increasing their CO₂ emissions in the next 10 years by far more than the amount which we will be reducing even if we achieve the goals. And if that is the case and that is the projections, then we have to wonder how the earth has been benefited if our reductions are in fact cancelled out and then some by the increases in CO₂ by the Third World, no matter how fair that may be in the economic sense or no matter that, of course as we all know, we in the western world, per capita, account for far more emissions than persons living in the Third World account for.

I'm also concerned that some of the other great moves that the North American hemisphere has taken to combat pollution — for instance, the cleanup of the Great Lakes, reducing sulphur and acid rain emissions, the move to unleaded gas. We know in each of these cases industry was reluctant to come on side. We know that there were . . . there was information public that it would bankrupt us. In each and every case industry did, in fact, conform and comply with no noticeable ill effects. However, we also know that those new standards were put in place because Canada and the United States made a joint decision. So once the continent had decided on a joint course of action, industry could and did innovate and conform.

But the resolution before us this evening, Mr. Speaker, contains within it the guarantee that compliance with Kyoto will not be allowed to compromise the Saskatchewan economy. Also this resolution, having been ratified by every province and territory, keeps us onside with every other province, including Alberta.

So I say to my friends in the Saskatchewan Party, how can they be opposed to something that Premier Klein is in fact in favour

of because Premier Klein has indicated his support to the resolution that is before us today. And Premier Klein has said that now the issue is not ratification because after all we have ratified, so passing a resolution that we not ratify is pointless because in fact we have ratified. The issue now, according to Premier Klein, is how we work through an implementation plan and that implementation plan must not be allowed to compromise the economies of our nation or individual provinces. That is good enough for Ralph Klein and I say it ought to be good enough for my friends in the Saskatchewan Party.

Well I don't think we need to be more Albertan than the Albertans and I say that this is a resolution that every single premier has accepted and we should go with it. I also say that Kyoto, properly implemented, represents an economic opportunity as well as a challenge.

We need to lead the world in environmental technologies into the new economy. The great challenge of the 21st century will be to de-link energy consumption and economic growth from environmental pollution. This is a challenge and this is an opportunity. And we can do it.

Mr. Speaker, we can be a leading edge, an energy efficient province, a leading way in the production of new energy. We can play a leadership role and benefit from the global shift to the new technologies and to new industries. We have the synchrotron — a tool that will allow Canada to set the standards of environmental remediation. Rather than catering to suitcase scientists, Saskatchewan could see home-grown environmental companies spring up around the synchrotron creating careers, not just jobs.

Strategic investments should be made now so that synchrotron can achieve us . . . in achieving not just clean technology and clean coal technology but also in creating a new economy. Well by cleaning up our thermal coal plants we will not just have a cleaner environment, we'll not just reduce the emissions of sulphur dioxide, but we will spur whole new industries.

You have to question the leadership of this province when Louisiana Coal and not SaskPower ends up being the partner of Potash Corporation and Airborne Technologies to pursue clean coal technology.

Bio-products, enzymes like those used in ethanol production and bio-diesel, all these can be used to increase clean energy production. Growth in bio-based products will stimulate value-added industry in Saskatchewan and spur economic growth.

Iogen Corporation is a company that's on the leading edge of ethanol from wheat straw. But why do they stay away from Saskatchewan? Why are we not encouraging Iogen which is making ethanol from wheat straw to come to this province when CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) is more interested in a side deal with Broe from Denver?

We have the Weyburn miscible flood where the Government of Canada and other partners have established an internationally recognized test case for CO₂ injection and storage. That process for enhanced oil recovery is delivering oil that would otherwise

be unrecoverable.

Why is CO₂, I ask, being pumped from North Dakota and not being captured right here in Saskatchewan? We need clean coal technology at Shand or Boundary or Coronach that would create a pure CO₂ stream, a pipeline backbone to transport that resource to our oil fields and coal/methane beds, and a sustainable oil and gas industry that is cleaner and reduces pollution.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan can benefit from increased research and economic development and the industrial research program area and in the new partnership fund. We need to provide Saskatchewan people and Saskatchewan business with the tools and the incentives to take a lead in these new opportunities.

We are the place where we can research and develop houses fit for climate extremes. We can export those building technologies around the world, especially in northern climates, because of our high efficiency and expertise in the area of gas furnaces, windows, and heat-recovery ventilators. There will be a huge industry and a huge market around the world for boilers, furnaces, heating and cooling systems, micro-cogeneration, energy management control systems, and fuel switching. We can be part of that; we should not reject it.

We can begin by switching to the use of more ethanol. We can ask for ethanol-blended gasoline at the pumps. The government can make a start by equipping all civil service vehicles with E85 vehicles and ethanol use. We can demand that municipalities start using more bio-diesel. Right now as we speak, Mr. Speaker, Montreal has 150 buses running on bio-diesel. There are only two in the entire province of Saskatchewan. Wouldn't that be wonderful to think of our municipal transit system operating on canola? This is not pie in the sky — it's being done right now in Montreal. It should be done here. Ontario has exempted bio-diesel from the fuel tax in that province. We should do the same.

Another product that will be . . . that will add value for Saskatchewan families is — and another market for our canola — is bio-diesel. We should be using it; we should be using biofuels. And this is another way in which there are opportunities. It is not just a deficit for the people of Saskatchewan.

Since 1991 the use of low tillage has increased by 350 per cent and summerfallow has decreased by 40 per cent in this province. Agriculture alone will generate carbon sink for Canada of 10 megatonnes through our efficient farming methods. There is no upper limit on Canada's agricultural sinks. As marginal lands are converted to more profitable usage, Kyoto will bring about a domestic emissions trading system linked to an international carbon market. Carbon will have a price and that price can benefit our farmers. Farmers will be paid a premium to convert marginal land to perennial cover, to protect our water resources by enhancing wildlife habitat, and to be paid to integrate shelter belts into the agricultural landscape.

(21:00)

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is not in fact an amendment at all.

It simply repeats the resolution. It repeats the 12 points. We are moving into a brave new world. We know it is a world we must enter whether we want to or not. Our challenge is to make sure that these new measures will not impair the economy of Saskatchewan and the economy of Canada. It is our duty to make sure that Kyoto represents new challenges, not only for a cleaner environment and a cleaner world, but also new economic opportunities for us.

By working with the implementation plan and by working with the 10 points, we can ensure that any possible negative effect is minimized, and we can capture the benefits for Saskatchewan, its people, and its economy. We should not sit this out. Premier Klein does not recommend we sit this out. Premier Klein has said, we ratify, then we go on to work with the implementation plan.

And so I don't think it makes any sense to say we shouldn't implement what's already been implemented; we shouldn't ratify what's already been ratified. Instead we should say we are going to work with our sister provinces, all of whom — including Alberta — have adopted a 10-point plan for implementation. And we will work within that implementation to make sure that Kyoto works for Saskatchewan and works for Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Goulet: — Mr. Speaker, I would just love to get into the debate tonight on Kyoto. And I was listening to some commentary by the different speakers, and I noted a comment, a word used for example, fanatic — which I'll make some commentary about tomorrow — by the Leader of the Opposition. And there's other few comments I would like to make, but seeing that it's after 9, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 21:05.